



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/620,840	07/21/2000	Lance E. Steward	D-2885	4487
33197	7590	07/19/2004		
STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS LLP 4 VENTURE, SUITE 300 IRVINE, CA 92618				
			EXAMINER HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON	
			ART UNIT 1647	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/620,840	STEWART ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 65-69 and 71-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 65-67, 72-74 and 78 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 68-69, 71, 75-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 5/17/04 has been entered.
2. The rejection of claims 68-69 & 71 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and incomplete is withdrawn due to the amendment of the claims.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/04 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.
5. Claims 65-67, 72-74 & 78 are allowed. However, it is suggested amending claim 72 to “wherein the additional leucine based motif of SEQ ID NO: 2 increases the [a] half-life...”, amending claim 65 to “decreases the [a] half-life...”, and amending claim 78 to “leucine based motif of SEQ ID NO: 2 is deleted” would reflect more conventional claim language, and more clearly claim the invention.

6. Claims 68-69 & 71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for specific modified BoNT/A neurotoxin proteins with a definable sequence change and recited definable and assayable function, does not reasonably provide enablement for any structurally undefined additional sequences “in part” that do not reasonably possess the recited function. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, for the reasons made of record in Paper NOs. 17 (mailed 12/31/02), 22 (mailed 11/10/03) & 20040311.

As previously made of record, pages 12-13 & 26 of the specification describe leucine-based motifs, in which additional leucine-based motifs putatively increase the biological half-life of BoTN/A. In contrast, addition of only “part of a [7 amino acid] leucine based motif” would not reasonably have such function, because *the specification alternatively describes this 7 amino acid sequence as the minimal critical amino acid residues necessary to increase biological half-life of neurotoxins*. In contrast to Applicants’ assertions, one of skill in the art at the time of filing Applicants’ invention would not know how to make and use such modified BoTN/A molecules that have increased biological half-life without requiring undue experimentation to determine such; consistent with the teachings of Rudinger previously made of record.

7. Claims 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for specific modified BoNT/A neurotoxin proteins with a definable sequence change and recited definable and assayable function, does not reasonably provide

enablement for any structurally undefined additional “leucine based motif” sequences that possess no recited function. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, for similar reasons already made of record in Paper NOs. 17 (mailed 12/31/02), 22 (mailed 11/10/03) & 20040311.

8. Claims 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and incomplete for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is ambiguous what metes and bounds a “naturally-occurring leucine based motif of the toxin” entails “wherein the leucine based motif of SEQ ID NO: 2 is *not* the same as that of the naturally-occurring leucine based motif” [emphasis added]. It should be noted that the courts have held that negative limitations that exclude compounds do not meet the requirements of 35 USC 112 because it attempts to claim the invention by excluding what was not invented rather than what was invented. *In re Schechter*, 205 F2d 185, 98 USPQ 144 (CCPA 1953).

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1647

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (571) 272-0885. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, and alternate Fridays, from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached on (571) 272-0961. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.
July 15, 2004

ROBERT C. HAYES, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER



BRENDA BRUMBACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600